App F.IX-4

1925-26

Previous References (Misc)

File No. 224-25

Serial Nos. 3, 10, 16

Later references.
362-27-1-10

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 3, 10 & 16

Part B for February 1926

SUBJECT

Interpellation No. 19 of the Legis: Council
of 23-2-26.

re Medical Inspection Camps.

Reply sent to Legislative Council Section.

F. R. S. 11] 191 .

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mcy)

NOTES.

File No. 224

FILE HEADING

Legislative Council Interpellation by Mr. J. Rudrappa. No. 19

From

The Legislative Secretary

No. 3702-6 Dated 8 2 26 Received

Diary No. 876 Enclos Spare Copies Serial No. 3

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Interpellates on certain points regarding the Yediyur Siddalingeswaraswamy Temple.

Sl	NOTES AND ORDERS.
10	To the Mcy Commr, letter no 6028 & 6226 calls for information on the interpellation.
16	From the same, letter no. C. 968 of 25-4 & 16/2/26 Furnishes the information called for and also a copy of the scale of expenditure sanctioned for the temple.

NOTES—First Sheet.

WD 01264 -GPB -40,000—17-12-.
App. F. III—2]

Revenue tariat

File No. 224 of 1925. 2

Serial No.

The Resolution of the Municipal Conference referred to in the interpellation (d) was sent to the Mun: Comrs for necessary action, with a request that the action taken may be reported to Govt (vide Letter no. 372/Mun 91-25-2 & 30-9-25 put up herewith) - The action taken, the Mun: Comrs states in his present letter, would be reported to Govt, separately.

2 As regards the appointment of Dharmadarsis (c), further information was called for & the file is in ... (vide Mun: file 127-25 put up.) -

3. Subd for orders as to whether the replies furnished by the M.C. may be adopted.

8d
18-2-26

The following replies are suggested, for consideration:-

(a) } The answer is in the negative
(b) }
(c) The following nine gentlemen:- have been recommended as Dharmadarsis. Of whom 5 are Viz.,* This is adequate having regard to the fact that only 25% of the devolved duties are to be assigned

(*. Names will be quoted as given in the M.C's list).

(d) The matter is under enquiry in accordance with the M.C. Act

The resolution has been sent to the Mun: Comrs for taking necessary action in respect of the matters dealt with therein.

Rev. Secy
18-2-26

(Vide memo)

508/19-2

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 01264—GPB —40,000—17-12-24

File No. 224 of 1925 3

Serial No.

A typed draft is subd, for approval.

20/2 Rev. Secy 20/2

Hon. Member 20/2

555 20.2

Draft appr 20/2

20/2 20/2

REV. 9 FEB MUZRAI 1894

Interpellations by Mr.J.Rudrappa.

1. Will the Government be pleased to furnish information on the following:-- Muz 224-25 3

(a) Is it true that an order has been passed by the Muzrai Commissioner that the Parupathegar of Yedeyur temple in Kunigal taluk be removed and that a man of Veerasaiva community be appointed in his place? If the answer is in the affirmative when was the order passed, what action has been taken and at what stage is the question of removing the Parupathegar now?

(b) Has it come to the notice of Government that the Amildar of Kunigal is inducing by his official position some of the Veerasaivas of the taluk to give petitions for the retention of the present Parupathegar?

(c) What are the names of Dharmadarsis that have been recommended by the Amildar and is the number of Veerasaiva Dharmadarsis adequate enough for the management of the Yedeyur temple when servants and devotees of the temple are mostly Veerasaivas.

(d) What action have the Government taken on the resolutions of Kunigal Veerasaiva Conference held at Yedeyur in May 1925 copy of which have already been sent to Government regarding the removal of inconveniences to the pilgrims, the improvement of temple buildings and matters pertaining to the management of temple affairs.

Interpellation

by Mr. J. Rudrappa of Tumkur.

No.19-

(a) ~~It is~~ Is it true that an order has been passed by the Muzrai Commissioner that the Parpathegar of Yediyur temple in Kunigal Taluk be removed and that a man of Veerasaiva community be appointed in his place. If the answer is in the affirmative when was the order passed, what action has been taken and at what stage is the question of removing the Parpathegar now.

No such order has been issued by this office.

(b) Has it come to thenotice of Government that the Amildar of Kunigal is -- inducing by his official position ----- some of the Veerasaivas of the Taluk to give petitions for the retention of the present Parpathegar?

No such fact has come to the notice of this office.

(In this connection it is - however reported that only 25% of the devotees of the temple are lingayets and that the --- remaining 75% belong to other communities and that the --- replacement of the present - Parpathegar is not urged by the latter. During the present incumbents tenure of office the temple affairs are reported to have been properly managed and that no complaints have been received against him. The temple funds have considerably increased during his and his father's --- term of office.

c. What are the names of Dharmadarsis that have been recommended by the ---- Amildars and is the number of Veerasaiva Dharmadarsis adequate enough for the -- management of the Yediyur temple when servants and devotees of the temple are mostly veerasaivas?

men are reported mended by the Amildar.

(1) Mr. Y. Siddalingiah
(2) " Yediyurappa
(3) " Settarahakka Setti
(4) " Y. Siddiah
(5) " C. Linganna Gowda
(6) " V. Varadiengar
(7) " H. Dasegowda
(8) " Chennamallappa Gowda
(9) " Dallali Rudrappa (Conve

Out of 9 gentlemen 5 propo are Lingayets and this appears t adequate having regard to the that only 25% of the devotees a Lingayets.

d. What action have been the Governm-ent taken on the resolutions of ---- Kunigal Veerasaiva Conference held at Yediyur in May 1925. Copies of which have already been sent to Government regarding the removal of inconveniences to the pilgrims, the improvement of - temple buildings and matters pertaining to the management of temple affairs.

Proposals in regard to th matters referred to in the ---- resolutions are under consider

(The report of action t will be reported separately for information of Government. Vid Revenue Secretary's letter C.N 91-25-2 dated 30-9-25.)

16/9/26

Muzrai Commissioner.

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to... 8.7.4.

General and Revenue Secretariat
(Mun)
the 192

Date of issue..... 10.2.26

Signed by.....

~~Standing Orders~~

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Mun
File No. 224-25
Seria No. 10
No. 1028
Circle

To The Deputy Commr. in Mysore, Bangalore

Sir,

I am directed to forward ~~a copy~~ here with ~~a copy~~ of Interpellations Nos 1 & 2 by Mr. J. Rudrappa M.L.C to be answered at the ~~re the appointment of Commissioners to enquire into the Legislative Council, on the 23rd inst.~~ and to request that the information required ~~called for~~ therein may be furnished within 5 days.

I have etc

for Secretary
Rev: Deputy

30/7/26

over 10/2/26

No. C 9687 26-6 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 16th February 1926.

34940

From B. Ramaswamaiya, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, C 939

Bangalore.

Muz 224-25-16

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.1028/M.F.224-25-10 dated 10th Instant, sending a copy of interpellation No.19 by Mr. J. Rudrappa, I have the honor to forward herewith a memo giving the information therein required in respect of the temple at Yedigur in the Kunigal Taluk.

2. Two printed copies of this office order R.Dis.No.50/22-23 dated 15th January 1923, fixing a revised scale of expenditure in the temple are sent for reference.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

16/2/26

for Muzrai Commissioner.

Absent on Casual leave

KSR.

ORDER OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Reference—

Government Proceedings No. 960-62—Muz 94-19-2, dated 12th September 1919 sanctioning a scale of expenditure for Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

2. Proposals dated 20th April 1922, framed by the Muzrai Superintendent for revising the scale of expenditure of the temple as a result of a detailed personal enquiry and the representations made by the temple servants and Dharmadarsis.

3. Letter No. O. C 668 of 21-22, dated 21st December 1922, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, proposing certain additions in the scale of expenditure

ORDER R. DIS. No. 50—22-23, DATED 15TH JANUARY 1923.

The revised scale of expenditure, as appended to this order, is sanctioned with effect from 1st February 1923

K. R. SRINIVASIENGAR,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District returning the records.
The Comptroller to Government of Mysore

Exd—P S. R. N

ORDER OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE

Reference—

Government Proceedings No. 960-62—Muz 94-19-2, dated 12th September 1919 sanctioning a scale of expenditure for Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

2. Proposals dated 20th April 1922, framed by the Muzrai Superintendent for revising the scale of expenditure of the temple as a result of a detailed personal enquiry and the representations made by the temple servants and Dharmadarsis.

3. Letter No. O. C. 668 of 21-22, dated 21st December 1922, from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, proposing certain additions in the scale of expenditure.

ORDER R. DIS. No. 50—22-23, DATED 15TH JANUARY 1923.

The revised scale of expenditure, as appended to this order, is sanctioned with effect from 1st February 1923

K R. SRINIVASIENGAR,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District returning the records.
The Comptroller to Government of Mysore.

Exd—P S. R. N

Statement showing the income of the past five years from 1916-17 of Sri Siddalingeswaraswami temple at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

No	Items	1916-17	1917-18	1918-19	1919-20	1920-21	Total	Average	Remarks
		Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	Rs a p	
1	Uttama monday .	475 0 0	490 0 0	410 0 0	430 0 0	432 0 0	2,237 0 0	447 0 0	
2	Hola monday ..	105 0 0	108 0 0	100 0 0	62 0 0	65 0 0	440 0 0	88 0 0	
3	Sale of manure ...	11 0 0	5 0 0	3 0 0	11 0 0	10 0 0	40 0 0	8 0 0	
4	Shop tax ..	110 0 0	176 0 0	165 0 0	182 0 0	163 0 0	826 0 0	165 0 0	
5	Sale of shavings (hair) ..	190 0 0	222 0 0	150 0 0	190 0 0	465 0 0	1,217 0 0	243 0 0	
6	Sale of guggula ..	125 0 0	137 0 0	100 0 0	105 0 0	140 0 0	607 0 0	122 0 0	
7	Sale proceeds of Kappa kanike and offerings of cocoanut Gutta for offering cocoanuts ..	68 0 0 65 0 0	68 0 0 70 0 0	68 0 0 70 0 0	70 0 0 85 0 0	70 0 0 78 0 0	344 0 0 368 0 0	69 0 0 74 0 0	
	Total ..	1,179 0 0	1,276 0 0	1,066 0 0	1,135 0 0	1,423 0 0	6,079 0 0	1,216 0 0	

Statement showing the existing and the proposed scale of expenditure in the temple of Sri Siddalingeswaraswami at Yediyur, Kunigal Taluk.

No	Existing: Items	Amount	Remarks	No	Proposed: Items	Amount	Remarks
		Rs a p				Rs. a. p	
	I Establishment				I Establishment—		
1	Parpathegar ..	5 0 0		1	Parpathegar	8 0 0	
2	Musicians—			2	Musicians—		
	Mohari 4 4 0	..			Mohari .. 4 8 0	..	
	Sruti .. 3 4 0	..			Sruti .. 3 8 0	...	
	Davane . 2 12 0	...			Davane .. 3 0 0	..	
	Jagate . 2 4 0	12 8 0			Jagate ... 2 8 0	13 8 0	
3	Jadimali and Rangoli ..	1 0 0		3	Jadimali and Rangoli	1 4 0	
4	Mashalchi 2 at 0-8 0 each .	1 0 0		4	Mashalchi 2 at 0 12 0 each	1 8 0	
5	Devatige 4 at 0-8 0 each ...	2 0 0		5	Devatige 4 at 0-12-0 each .	3 0 0	
6	Huvadiga	0 8 0		6	Huvadiga .. .	0 12 0	
7	Kaval, sweeper and caretaker of buildings	5 0 0		7	Kaval, sweeper and caretaker of buildings . ..	6 0 0	
8	Contingencies	0 8 0		8	Contingencies ..	1 0 0	
	Total ...	27 8 0	Per month or		Total ..	35 0 0	Per month or
		330 0 0	per year			420 0 0	per year
	II Nityakatle— All items of paditara and deeparadhane expenses to be defrayed by the archaks from the income of the inam lands in their possession.				II. Nityakatle— All items of paditara and deeparadhane expenses to be defrayed by the archaks from the income of the inam lands in their possession		
	III Hetchukatle—				III Hetchukatle—		
1	His Highness the Maharaja's Buthday ..	2 0 0		1	His Highness the Maharaja's Birthday ..	2 0 0	
2	Rathotheava	140 0 0		2	Rathothsava	150 0 0	
3	Special worship on Mondays during Sravana	4 0 0		3	Feeding the poor during Jatra ...	100 0 0	
4	Gouri			4	Special worship on Mondays in Sravana ..	4 0 0	
5	Dasara	1 0 0		5	Gouri	1 0 0	
6	Special worship during Kartika ...	10 0 0		6	Dasara	10 0 0	
7	Kruthikothsava ..	15 0 0		7	Special worship during Kartika .	15 0 0	
8	Annual white washing etc.	5 0 0		8	Kruthikothsava .	5 0 0	
		25 0 0		9	Annual white washing etc ..	25 0 0	
	Total ..	202 0 0	Per annum		Total ..	312 0 0	Per annum
	Grand Total ..	532 0 0	Per annum		Grand Total ..	732 0 0	Per annum

W D 1723—GPB—105—11-9 25

INTERPELLATION BY Mr. J. RUDRAPPA.

Will the Government be pleased to furnish information on the following:

Interpellation	Reply.
(a) Is it true that an order has been passed by the Muzrai Commissioner that the Parupathegar of Yedeyur temple in Kunigal Taluk be removed and that a man of Veerasaiva community be appointed in his place? If the answer is in the affirmative when was the order passed, what action has been taken and at what stage is the question of removing the Parupathegar now?	b (a) & (c) The answer is in the negative.
(b) Has it come to the notice of Government that the Amildar of Kunigal is inducing by his official position some of the Veerasaivas of the Taluk to give petitions for the retention of the present Parupathegar?	
(c) What are the names of Dharmadarsis that have been recommended by the Amildar and is the number of Veerasaiva Dharmadarsis adequate enough for the management of the Yedeyur temple when servants and devotees of the temple are mostly Veerasaivas.	(c) The following nine gentlemen have been recommended as Dharmadarsis of whom 5 are Veerasaiva ~~This is inadequate~~ considered adequate, having regard to the fact that only about 25% of the devotees are reported to be ~~Lingayetas~~ of this community. 1. Mr. Y. Siddalingiah 2. " Yediyurappa 3. " Settarahakka Setti 4. " Y. Siddiah 5. " C. Linganna Gowda 6. " V. Varadiengar 7. " H. Dasegowda. 8. " Chennamallappa Gowda 9. " Dallali Rudrappa (Convenor)
(d) What action have the Government taken on the resolutions of the Kunigal Veerasaiva Conference held at Yedeyur in May 1925 copies of which have already been sent to Government regarding the removal of inconveniences to the pilgrims, the improvement of temple buildings and matters pertaining to the management of temple affairs.	(d) ~~A copy of~~ The resolutions have been sent to Muzrai Commissioner for taking needful action in respect of the matters dealt with therein.

20.2.26 20/2 20, 2

INTERPELLATION BY Mr. J. RUDRAPPA.

No 19

Will the Government be pleased to furnish information on the following:

Interpellation

Reply.

(a) Is it true that an order has been passed by the Muzrai Commissioner that the Parupathegar of Yedeyur temple in Kunigal Taluk be removed and that a man of Veerasaiva community be appointed in his place? If the answer is in the affirmative when was the order passed, what action has been taken and at what stage is the question of removing the Parupathegar now?

(b) Has it come to the notice of Government that the Amildar of Kunigal is inducing by his official position some of the Veerasaivas of the Taluk to give petitions for the retention of the present Parupathegar?

(a)(b) The answer to these questions is in the negative.

(c) What are the names of Dharmadarsis that have been recommended by the Amildar and is the number of Veerasaiva Dharmadarsis adequate enough for the management of the Yedeyur temple when servants and devotees of the temple are mostly Veerasaivas?

The following nine gentlemen have been recommended as Dharmadarsis, Of whom 5 are Veerasaivas

1. Mr. Y. Siddalingiah
2. " Yediyurappa
3. " Settarahakka Setti
4. " Y. Siddiah
5. " C. Linganna Gowda.
6. " V. Varadiengar
7. " H. Dasegowda.
8. " Chennamallappa Gowda
9. " Dallali Rudrappa (Convenor)

The number of Veerasaiva Dharmadarsis is considered adequate, having regard to the fact that only about 25% of the devotees are reported to belong to this community.

(d) What action have the Government taken on the resolutions of the Kunigal Veerasaiva Conference held at Yedeyur in May 1925 copies of which have already been sent to Government regarding the removal of inconveniences to the pilgrims, the improvement of temple buildings and matters pertaining to the management of temple affairs.

A copy of the resolutions have been sent to the Muzrai Commissioner for taking needful action in respect of the matters dealt with therein.

20/2